

REMARKS

Claims 15-28, 30, 45-58, and 60 are pending in this application. In the Office Action dated July 16, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 15-17, 20-22, 28, and 30. The Examiner objected to claims 18, 19, and 23-27 and allowed claims 45-58 and 60. In particular claims 15-17, 20-22, 28, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,262,121 to Goodno ("Goodno") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,834,082 to Day ("Day").

As indicated above, Applicants have amended claims 15, 30, 45, and 60 to address the Examiner's objection. Specifically, Applicants have replaced the word "resin" in these claims with the correct term, "resin," per the Examiner's objection on page 2 of the Office Action. No change in the scope of these claims is intended by this amendment.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See M.P.E.P. § 2142, 8th Ed., Rev. 5 (August 2006). "[I]n formulating a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based upon a combination of prior art elements, it remains necessary to identify the reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the prior art elements in the manner claimed." *USPTO Memorandum* from Margaret A. Focarino, Deputy Commissioner for Patent Operations, May 3, 2007, page 2. "[T]he analysis supporting a rejection ... should be made explicit" and it is "important to identify

a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the [prior art] elements in the manner claimed.” Id. (citing *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, No. 04-1350 (U.S. Apr. 30, 2007)). Because Goodno and Day do not teach or suggest every element of claims 15-17, 20-22, 28, and 30, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Claims 15-17, 20-22, 28, and 30 all require either “a first applying component configured to apply” or “an applying means for applying a frame mandrel to the mandrel to form a frame for the structure.” The Office Action apparently relies on Goodno for the teaching of this elements and identifies one or all of elements numbered 40, 46, and 30 in that reference as a “frame mandrel.” (See Office Action at p. 3.) Goodno, however, does not teach a component or means for applying “a frame mandrel to the mandrel to form a frame for the structure,” and none of the elements numbered 40, 46, and 30, identify a frame mandrel.

To the contrary, element number 40 in Goodno appears to refer to areas of a mandrel 29 that “extend slightly beyond the finished trim length of the composite part.” (Goodno, col. 5:55-58.) Element number 46 appears to be a “fill opening … provided for the introduction of fill media into the flexible mandrel 29.” (Id. at col. 5:58-61.) And, element number 30 appears to be an “end cap piece” of the mandrel. (Id. at col. 6:62-63.) In fact, Goodno only discloses a single mandrel 29 and does nowhere discloses applying a frame mandrel to mandrel 29. Therefore, none of the asserted elements of Goodno teaches or suggests “a first applying component configured to apply” or “an

applying means for applying a frame mandrel to the mandrel to form a frame for the structure," as disclosed in the pending application.

The Office Action appears to rely on Day only for the disclosure of a "second applying component" and does not assert that Day discloses "a first applying component configured to apply" or "an applying means for applying a frame mandrel to the mandrel to form a frame for the structure." (Office Action at p. 3.) No additional reference has been cited by the Examiner that discloses these elements. In addition, the Examiner does not provide "an explicit reason" to modify the cited references to include at least this missing limitation.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 15-17, 20-22, 28, and 30.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 18, 19, and 23-27 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. As articulated in the arguments above, however, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 15 from which claims 18, 19, and 23-27 depend, and respectfully request that the rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that claims 18, 19, and 23-27 depend from an allowable base claim and respectfully request that the objection to these claims be withdrawn as well.

Application No.: 10/712,042
Attorney Docket No. 7707.0019-01

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 16, 2007

By: 

Hayley S. Weimer
Reg. No. 57,009